

115 Per 6, Drs - Cultural Seminars 5/3/83

Opened by Dr. Daniel

(Beverly Room)

Seminars

~~TAPE #6~~ Present in 2/28/83 at Grand Round of Dept Psychiatry Cambridge Hospital by Dr. [unclear] 115 Per 6

Brown (Discussing Dr. Ellingson) Also be a way for some people to regulate their self esteem. We could make a case probably for Reagan's narcissism and how he handles that by being President. But here I want to focus more on [unclear] May and what he may be doing. People involve themselves in certain activities, according to Stroh to maintain the cohesion, the stability, and the positive affective coloring to the self representation, If they get involved in things. Now sometimes - we look at narcissism in terms of inter-psychic mechanism such as the kind of grandiosity that narcissists have and certainly ~~and~~ Kohut and others have written a lot about the grandiose self image (Kohut) of narcissists and how that can compensate for feeling lousy about oneself. There's been a lot written about fantasies of power and glory of narcissists. There are several articles on the Noble Prize Complex for narcissists and other kind of fantasies. One could make cases for military power, as ~~an~~ a preoccupation in the lives of narcissists. But what I want to focus more on is not so much the internal fantasies, but the behaviors in relationship with others. Because going back to what Alexander's point is, that sometimes we involve other people in the ~~service~~ service of regulating our esteem and this case ~~in~~ you can involve entire countries, the stakes get very high. Narcissists are people who don't feel complete in themselves. They feel in some ways that something is missing and Kohut talks a lot about self-object relationships or we look to others to provide what is missing in ourselves. ~~and~~ We are constantly seeking from others some sense of completing what is missing in ourselves, and when others fall short of that, there's a sense that somehow we are going to be disappointed by others, that they are not quite able to provide us with what we are constantly seeking for. I'm reminded here of what you said about LeMay's life and that he never quite had his dreams fulfilled. There was this great disappointment, in that even though he was able to carry out his vision, he never got the recognition that he wanted, that he wanted, for this grand scheme of his.

MBG for the B-70.

Right. The B-70 in particular. That's characteristic of this kind of great quest of a narcissist and ~~that~~ the ways that it always falls short of ~~that~~. Another aspect of narcissistic behavior I think that is important here is that narcissists are performers. They see themselves in terms of the images they present to the world. ~~and~~ Again, one could make a case for the President. ~~But to stay with Curtis LeMay,~~ This is a guy who is preoccupied with his own image. But he is also preoccupied with the image of the country, and that's characteristic narcissistic behavior. We have to present this image to the world, ~~of~~ toughness, of having the most power and the most might. I'm struck by this article, "The Introduction to ~~Ed~~ <sup>Ed</sup> ~~Limpson's~~ <sup>Limpson's</sup> ~~Cook~~ <sup>Cook</sup> 'The Call to Mutiny,'" and that really what the article speaks to. That what we've gotten ourselves involved in here, with LeMay and a bunch of people like that, are people who are preoccupied with having to show their power. That may be an individual issue of psycho pathology, but on this level it becomes an issue where the stakes are high because it ~~affects~~ affects everybody else's life, <sup>right now,</sup> and <sup>the</sup> the condition of the world. We have to puff up <sup>the</sup> this image. And then Burston has written about different styles of narcissistic behaviors. There are different kinds of narcissists, and he lists four kinds of narcissists. The first is called the craving narcissist, and those are people who are constantly looking to others for support. They get themselves involved in very dependent relationships. When ~~they~~ <sup>they</sup> their life is totally changed by these relationships, <sup>they</sup> fall passionately in love, and then there is some disillusionment and <sup>they</sup> give up the relationship and they form another relationship. This is the National Enquirer movie star syndrome. Love relationships that fall apart and they get <sup>themselves</sup> in another love relationship and that fall apart, and then that fall apart, they get involved in another love relationship, they get married again, they get divorced. It's a style of looking to the other to get what is missing in oneself. Another style is called the paranoid style. These are people who go around very suspicious and they feel ripped off by the world

and they are always causing some sort of law suit or <sup>bringing</sup> some complaint against someone. And if they can get other people to respond and they win their court case, then they feel better about themselves. They get ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ everybody <sup>literally</sup> wrapped-up in this kind of legal pursuit. The third style is the socio-pathic style and this is a style in which one really takes from the world and feels better when they can just take <sup>from the world</sup>. The fourth style that is calls the phallic narcissistic style which I think speaks to Lemay quite well. I'll read what Thurston says about it, because it really does seem to fit. From International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1973. Called "Some Narcistic personality types."

"The phallic narcissistic ~~XXXXXX~~ personality has been described by Wilheim Reich and others. These are the men's men. They often have been called passive-aggressive. They parade their masculinity, <sup>along</sup> often ~~are~~ athletic and aggressive lines. In common with some manipulative personalities, they tend to be both exhibitionistic and reckless. (It's the theme of recklessness that's important here). While the exhibitionism of the manipulative personality or the socio-pathology ~~XXXXX~~ personality tends to ~~to~~ call attention to <sup>his</sup> good behavior and reputation, The phallic narcissist tends more to show ~~XXXXXXX~~ himself off and to exhibit his body, his clothes, and his manliness. The socio-pathetic person <sup>in his</sup> more reckless ~~XXXX~~ schemes, deceptions, and manipulations. <sup>however,</sup> Phallic narcissist <sup>in his</sup> tends more toward feats of recklessness, daring such as driving automobiles at excessive speeds in order to prove his power." (We could look at the whole arms race as a massive feat of recklessness at the expense of the whole world here, in order to prove the power of LeMay and a group of narcissistically-oriented people ~~who~~ managed to get themselves into a very powerful position here). Many phallic narcissistic men seem to have a dual attitude toward women. On the one hand they talk about in contemptuous terms, <sup>the locker room</sup> provocative language, on the other they are <sup>the</sup> defenders of motherhood and the sanctity of women." (One could talk about the values of Reagan and the Moral Majority there - his image of women and you could get both sides of

that quite easily. I don't know much about LeMay in that regard, So we get this need to puff-up images in a very reckless way and a dangerous way in order to regulate one's own esteem. We also know, particularly from the work of ~~Kohut~~ and others the characteristic lack of concern for others, the lack of empathy that narcissist<sup>s</sup> shows, <sup>as</sup> part of the character development. So that here we have that elaborate gain, a reckless gain of nuclear warfare on the one hand, and yet it is really hard to communicate to the Curtis LeMay's of the world any real concern that we are talking about people dying here. They just don't get it because it is not part of the character structure and I don't think that you are going to communicate that easily.

Now I want to turn to one more nice piece of work on narcissism, and that's the work ~~of~~ <sup>of</sup> ~~Shelley~~ <sup>Bach</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>He</sup> talks about the main problem in narcissism ~~as~~ the discontinuity of the awareness of themselves. <sup>It is that</sup> ~~In fact~~ discontinuity that affects esteem because the attention to themselves, their reflective awareness ~~is~~, is always going in and out. So they can't sustain good feeling about themselves in any regular way.

MBG - <sup>what</sup> ~~attribute this~~  
~~Where does he think this leads to?~~

He thinks ~~that~~ a developmental defect in reflective awareness is the base of it. And it has an effect on one's experience of one's body and the experience of one's cognition, and it gives one a sense of discontinuity of the self. Now Erickson talks about ~~the~~ <sup>one's</sup> <sup>primarily</sup> sense of self in terms of continuity, ~~and~~ that identity means having continuity all the time, that narcissists don't have this continuity with the same degree. They are constantly worried about the continuity of their experience and they are also worried about keeping intact and keeping alive. They experience at times a kind of inner deadness - emptiness - and they don't know where the body boundaries stop and where they begin at times. There are some symptoms - a lot of times narcissistic patients of this kind have ~~hypochondriacal~~ concerns which are really, again, show some weakness in the way they experience their body image. But one of the things that is characteristic of some of these patients is they have a lot of experience with different states of consciousness

disassociate <sup>ive</sup> states, ~~and~~ one of the characteristic things is the experience of flying flight - which is interesting -

MBG — You mean when they are decompensated...?

No, this is an example - a <sup>narcissistic</sup> woman whom we saw in the OPD last year and she was quite well intact, but she was saying that when she was a kid she had this experience once of - she was flying - she believed that she was actually on the ceiling flying - her parent's walked in one day and she said, "look, I'm flying," and her parent's said, "Oh, come down for dinner." That was the injuring and the disappointment that the parent's couldn't quite mirror - <sup>her</sup> the elation of flight. But her experience was that she actually flew, and I have seen this with several narcissistic patients and <sup>Bach</sup> talks about <sup>this kind of</sup> ~~these~~ things - that patients really feel the <sup>kind of</sup> alteration in the body image. One can use activities as an extension of that - a plane can become the extension of <sup>one's</sup> the body image as with a schizophrenic the room can be an extension of one's body image, and that one can feel the sort of excitement and aliveness ~~of~~ <sup>through</sup> being in a plane - it has like solid boundaries around it and you know where it stops and you have all these buttons you can push and you can be effective in the world and it goes up and down and you get this elated feeling and you feel very alive with it. This preoccupation with flying machines fits what one would find in certain <sup>kinds of</sup> narcissistic characters, and it probably gives them a sense of aliveness, <sup>But it never fully works because</sup> of this discontinuity <sup>of</sup> experience. So here we have a guy who is concerned with being alive on the one hand and yet ultimately behind that there is always a sense of deadness. Unfortunately, however, the deadness may not be his own inner deadness. It might be our own deadness, and that's what one gets when you are talking about incorporating other people into the environment into handling one's own pathology.

MBG That's what we are doing here.

Another dimension that ~~Brock~~ <sup>Bach</sup> speaks to is ~~that~~ language - narcissists never feel as though they are understood. They go about the world with this kind of

despair, that no one can really quite get it right, no one can properly ~~get~~ them right. So they do all these special twists with language, and sometimes they develop even special autistic languages of their own - special words - and I'm struck by again just little snatches - your phrase the other day that he would get enraged at people for making things too technical and he would tell them to simple it - <sup>he would</sup> little twists of language, but behind that is the sense that you have to try and do tricks with language because no one is really going to understand what you are trying to communicate - (including making up your own language)

~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> ~~Bach~~ <sup>Bach</sup>, Another area that narcissistics have difficulty in according to ~~Brock~~ is in volition - that nothing ever comes spontaneously, they don't know how to make spontaneous decisions. What they do is they organize themselves to be very controlled and anticipate everything. Now this can be very adaptive - like in working in the military and the precision that I am sure he emphasized. And as you describe this airlift, you know, with all of the planes going off at once - that kind of precision is very adaptive but also dangerous. But again here it may be <sup>intrapsychically</sup> ~~intercyclically~~ somehow of having to deal with this problem of not being able to ~~He~~ <sup>He</sup> ~~Bach~~ be spontaneous. Ultimately all this comes down to what ~~Brock~~ calls discontinuity in one's sense of one's self and the difficulty of feeling alive and the difficulty of feeling good about one's self. But here we have an individual who, put in a <sup>wrote</sup> ~~certain~~ position, may ~~like~~ the textbook of history by incorporating others into his adaptive mechanisms to handle his narcissistic concern, or the concern that I guess <sup>placed</sup> we are all ~~concerned~~ with, he may stop writing the books of history along with others.

"Dan, I have to flag one thing that you said and I won't go into detail, but I am sure it is what John had in mind as well. When you say, 'If you put such a person into a certain position in history, and you give it as a throwaway line, it's not a throwaway line; it is precisely the <sup>it's</sup> ~~complimentary~~ <sup>what is going on</sup> ~~between~~ <sup>in talking</sup> <sup>intrapsychically</sup> ~~intercyclically~~ with what's going on historically' that inevitably puts such an individual unique people into such a position in history. so that the tremendous question here is this: What is <sup>in the process</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>that</sup> <sup>is</sup> the egosynthesis which is dovetailing with what is going on in history? that makes this <sup>and</sup> a shared, defensive adaptive <sup>and</sup> ~~thing~~ <sup>hierarchy of function</sup> with a certain large we must ask, theoretically, moreover, <sup>and</sup> ~~then does it happen~~

That a large

a

segment of people around in the society can share in the gestalt, the  
a constellation that makes for the "fit" between a <sup>the life</sup> ~~the life~~  
"What can we say on an historical-cultural level that selects more and more <sup>the life</sup>  
narcissistic people?" <sup>another</sup> <sup>in the</sup>

Margaret - "Alright, but you are then going to have to ask, 'how does one begin to think

about altering that dovetailing so that a new adaptation

~~volves~~

"That's a great question..

"It is, it's the heart of the matter.

I just wanted to raise those things for discussion and again because I  
brought some of the papers.

Charles? "Margaret suggested that we respond in some way ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> your talk and provide something  
that might be valuable for you and for us to try and understand these things. I  
realize what a daunting task it is, not only because of the outstanding talk ~~that~~ <sup>that</sup>  
you gave but also because the subject is fundamentally, in my belief, incomprehensible,  
so we're sort of hurling attempts at understanding at a void, but having started  
with the depressive position I will try to do my best....but I think I am  
obviously referring to the incomprehensibility <sup>of the situation</sup> in which we find ourselves in  
general now.

It is very interesting, Dan and I did not talk about this together at all and  
yet much of my theme, which will emphasize the ~~so~~ <sup>socio</sup>-cultural dimension (which is  
in a large part the ~~sense~~ <sup>charge</sup> of this seminar) involves the concept of narcissism as well,  
but from a somewhat different angle.

One of the things that we have been talking about in the cross cultural  
seminar <sup>is</sup> the ways in which the typical psychopathology <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>culture</sup> mirrors  
and caricatures - the typical ~~one~~ <sup>of</sup> technically non-psychopathological behavior in  
the culture, and, from that point of view, we have certain characteristics ~~of~~ <sup>in</sup> psycho-  
pathological states or conditions in different cultures which are easier to see  
in ~~other~~ <sup>own</sup> ~~different~~ cultures than ours, partly because we are unfamiliar with them and so  
things stand out to us in a way that they don't stand out to us in our culture.

So, with some trepidation I mention that in our culture, we too, probably have our typical ethnic psychoses that mirror the general conditions of our society.

This is not an original thought, actually, one of Margaret's students, George

~~Devereux~~ <sup>Devereux</sup> Devereux has gone into great detail about the psychopathology characteristics of different cultures, and he wrote a very interesting paper in 1939 called

a "Sociological Theory of Schizophrenia" which I think foreshadows much of what has come later, even though he hasn't been given proper recognition for it,

particularly by Christopher Lasch's book, "The Culture of Narcissism" which

is quite a remarkable book. But one of Devereux's points is that <sup>our ethnic</sup> schizophrenia is psychosis ~~par excellence~~ <sup>and the ways</sup> he marshalls a good deal of

evidence for this, but the ways that he supports this theory involve, the

typical self-presentation of the schizophrenic and the ways in which that is

similar to certain ~~not~~ cultural values and ideals which we hold, <sup>I'm</sup> not

going to go into <sup>a</sup> great deal of detail about it, but the sense of mechanization

and deadness, the cognitive-affective split, the sense of impersonality, the

primitiveness of the expression or at least the consciousness of drive ~~impulses~~ <sup>impulses</sup>

such as murderous rage, and the sense of segmental relationships, that is, there

is a sense in which communal relationships which are typical in more group-

oriented cultures are no longer clearly characteristic of a kind of modern

mechanized, industrialized, Western culture. Relationships are largely segmented.

One has generally relationships with people with whom one has no emotional contact.

~~Devereux~~ <sup>Devereux</sup> Devereux uses the example of storekeepers' relationships that have no affective

charge to them, and the ways in which those characteristics of society are mirrored

in the schizophrenic's experience of relationships as sort of mechanistic, segmental,

or for that matter isolated from each other. Now, I'm only using this as a sort

of jumping off point, because in fact I am not going to talk about schizophrenia

but rather something that is closer to what Dan is talking about in terms of

narcissism, that is the sense that having emphasized the autonomy of the ego

(the autonomy of the self perhaps we should say, more accurately, the autonomy of the ego being a theoretical line)...

Having emphasized human autonomy perhaps in some senses at the expense of human intimacy, communal relations and so on, we are establishing a culture in which mechanization and impersonality is not only characteristic but in which it inevitably must be characteristic. But what is intriguing about this, I think, is that this is an illusion; this emphasis on autonomy, individualism, the <sup>phallic</sup> narcissism that Dan was describing is in some ways very illusory, because in fact it seems to me that in our culture our heavy emphasis on control and being controlled and fear of being controlled is always present at the periphery of consciousness. You referred the other day to Stanley Milgrims experiments. I think we might usefully think of that in terms of not only the murderous aggressiveness that lies within us all, but the need for absolute control in the sense of being absolutely out of control, that such a set of experiments points up. That is to say, the subjects are following the orders of the experimenter, the authority, and presumably willing to give over the autonomy, or perhaps more accurately one's own volition, to a higher authority. What one gets in return for that is the sense of absolute control over the stooge - the person who is presumably experiencing the shock. And in a relationship like this where there is a sort of dual sense of being absolutely out of control in relation to the superiors and absolutely in control of the people you have supposed power over is precisely the dilemma that you were outlining on Monday. <sup>while</sup> Notice the ways in which in fact we parade the value of autonomy, individualism, and so on, this suggests a state of ~~absolutely~~ slavery or rather master-slave type relationships. So, we might - I am thinking also of Randy Glasman's question to you about the ways in which the ..now that we can medically and genetically and in many, many ways in our lives control our environment, control our destiny, the ways in which, paradoxically enough, <sup>that</sup> leads us to feel quite out of control and quite a need to reassert an extreme and destructive control over our environment. The way that this fits into the group phenomena (and again one thing that I was extremely struck by was the learnedness not only of your presentation but of your spontaneous answer <sup>in which</sup> you managed to not only bring in Milgrims

experiments but Melanie Klein and Freud's great neglected classic, Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego.) That is precisely the area in which we have to go in order to understand these phenomena - that is the ways in which we as followers live through other people and live through the images of our leaders. When we see them like phallic narcissistic braggarts parading on the world stage throwing their weight around, in a certain sense we are fulfilling, in displacement, a certain ego ideal that we have. But it is a fantasy that we ~~xxx~~ are attempting to live out on the world stage. ~~what~~ we perhaps overlook and don't realize is that this is for keeps and this is reality, and that in a certain sense the leaders have few illusions about the fact that they are playing for keeps, that they in fact can order political massacres, again because of this sort of detached, depersonalized, mechanized, as you say, up in the sky and above the clouds way of killing. But that is almost a recipe for destruction in a certain sense, the ways in which we as a group identify with each other by projecting our ego ideal on to our leaders, and assuming they will both protect us from the Russians and at the same time show the Russians how big we are - sort of not in ourselves, not as individuals, but as Americans, as people who are powerful on the world stage. I can't escape the belief that you were outlining on Monday, and ~~that~~ Dan was too, that there is something characteristically and pathology<sup>ally</sup> male about this particular way of behaving, because I was just thinking that in your presentation of Curtis LeMay you didn't bring up the remarkable images ~~that~~ he uses ~~which~~ suggests a great deal of envy of women in terms of his description of the bombers - you know, "open the insides and ~~there~~ are babies in there clinging to the bellies," as well as his playful images of the little boys who make the snakes jump out at the little girls. In a certain sense it is true, <sup>that</sup> to say that this is individual psychopathology may be narrow and be <sup>a</sup> narrow point of view, ~~but~~ At the same time there is a way in which these themes and these fantasies from individual life do get lived out, thought out, and played out on the world stage. I just got out one of my favorite books and had to read this because it brings together so nicely what I have been thinking of anyway - I was so impressed with it that I have probably incorporated it into my

own thinking. The last paragraph of Civilization and Its Discontents - "the ~~fateful~~ faithful question for the human species seems to me whether and to what extent their cultural development will succeed in mastering the disturbance of their communal life by the human instinct of aggression and self-destruction." It may be that in this respect precisely ~~that~~ the present time deserves a special interest," and this remarkable line written in 1930 "Men have gained control over the forces of nature to such an extent that with their help they would have no difficulty in exterminating one another to the last man. They know this and hence comes a large part of their current unrest, their unhappiness, and their mood of anxiety. And now it is to be expected that the other of the two heavenly powers, eternal eros, will make an effort to assert himself in the struggle with his equally immortal adversary - monotose, but," he ends with the question, "who can foresee with what success and with what result?" It strikes me as astonishing that the one theory of Freud's that has been dumped on, laughed at and ~~criticized~~ the most is just this theory - the theory of the death instinct. At precisely the time that he is writing, before the holocaust, before the disasters of WW II and before the post-war nuclear potential disaster, that it is precisely during those 63 years since he wrote this that we have been - have most ignored that dimension of his theory, the absolute fundamental quality of human self-destructiveness. We put that theory down as if it were foolish, and at the same time we perch ourselves on the brink of self-destructiveness.

Margaret: I can't resist this <sup>parenthetically</sup> ~~comment, in a way~~ (because I do think it's time to hear what John was going to say) but I think probably, in defense of those of whom I have been one, who have attacked the death instinct, I don't believe that that discussion <sup>properly</sup> took place on the level of the quote you just read. I think probably, and <sup>I know</sup> it was true for me, in discussing the problems I had with seeing (clinically) ~~massacris~~ as an expression of "the death instinct", that that was of a quite different order of thinking - would you agree? (Very much so.)

So that its usage is therefore as to explain something ~~critically~~ <sup>clinically</sup> just seems all wet, leading nowhere, reductive in the worst sense and is really misleading.

I see what you mean, permitting us to disavow individual responsibility and the individual's life experience. That is, to trace masochism to the death instinct is precisely to overlook the individual's life.

M.G. Correct, correct. <sup>the death instinct is precisely to overlook</sup>  
But it is to precisely overlook the hierarchical ordering (as you nicely said) <sup>of divergent</sup> <sup>virgin</sup> functions.

John - D. Divergent functions in a gestalt sense. So I'm just defending those of us who have been attacking the death instinct. It was in a different ballpark.

NICK I was just interested in the matter of how to pitch all this theoretically -

how do you find the proper context <sup>ual</sup>, philosophical <sup>frame</sup> in which to link the individual, group, self, and others. Just wanted to caution about too much focus on character pathology as such, but I do think it has a place in the total network. I'm interested in how ideas that tend to get overlooked get overlooked - like in 1919 or 1920 when Freud wrote the <sup>"Group Analysis (1920)"</sup> <sup>Root</sup> Psychology and how these things get relegated to the shelves, what is the cultural resistance to ideas. - I'm interested in Dan <sup>Ellsberg's</sup> experiences with that, what he and I talked about, the world does not, (and perhaps there is a way to understand it) - it does not happily experience itself interpreted in id terms anymore, than the patients ~~id~~ - it tends to increase the resistance - you go around telling <sup>Reagan</sup> <sup>the current generation of</sup> <sup>terms that will</sup> <sup>the grounds of</sup> they are this or that... and they will properly defend themselves on the Russians and the need for national security etc. And they will have the better case, because they will be able to make their case ~~and~~ in reality <sup>demolish your case</sup>, so the question I am really interested more in is the socio-political effectiveness of germinating of ideas in this domain. You get involved in that when you venture out of rooms like this into other arenas and try to talk this language out there, and you sort of learn not to do it because you get demolished. This doesn't mean you are wrong, it just means the intellectual and strategic aspect of <sup>integrating</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>communicating</sup> <sup>the</sup> <sup>integrating</sup> ideas or <sup>the</sup> <sup>dynamics</sup> with reality hasn't been done enough or properly. <sup>and</sup> I guess my interest and hope is that somehow we can take this interdisciplinary, biographical, linking the public and private psychologies etc. out of the kind of <sup>Exper. Esse</sup> <sup>esoteric</sup>

your

quality it has now where you sort of, indulgent, administrative superiors allow you to have this seminar, <sup>at</sup> Cambridge Hospital, <sup>they would be</sup> bewildered to know what is going on in here - this is an unusual ~~esoteric~~ activity - even <sup>Bob</sup> Brock has said to me in the past weeks "What an unusual group of intellectuals you have assembled" but it is not taken very seriously. I am interested in why it is not taken seriously, why we, ourselves, do not take it seriously, this isn't the real business, the last ~~grand round when~~ ~~one~~ Dan talked on nuclear stuff a mental health worker stood up and said "Well these aren't important to me in my patients - I can't be involved in this sort of exciting, a nice event, Dan is tremendously inspiring, thing - this is inspiring etc. yet we will leave and go back to treating the <sup>we will</sup> real character disorders, the ones we are responsible for, and this will once again become a peripheral activity unless we pay attention to where it really belongs, and I guess my fantasy hope is that we will come to realize that we have a choice to either find a way to make this more than dabbling with applied analysis or something - I guess my questions are : <sup>we may be</sup> are we giving terminal care in our clinical work, not that one shouldn't give terminal care, you <sup>on the battlefield</sup> ~~practise~~ triage the bodies and you give terminal care, and that's appropriate, and yet I think that if we are content to give terminal care we should know that we are giving terminal care. How can we be effective with these ideas is what I am getting at. (John speaking <sup>me</sup>)

John, I gave a <sup>grand</sup> <sup>lecture</sup> at Mass General on precisely this subject and I was trying <sup>out</sup> <sup>Lifton</sup> as in a discussion with Bob <sup>Riffin</sup>, to try to bring into some kind of internal unity all of these areas of work that we are all engaged in, to be sure, that part of the responsibility that we have accepted in life has to do with <sup>the</sup> care of the real schizophrenic you are talking about. However, the situation <sup>of</sup> <sup>having</sup> history <sup>at</sup> becoming what it is, it seems to me that the only way that we can then feel justified in an <sup>esoteric</sup> <sup>is: I have</sup> seminar like this one, <sup>the beginning of every speech I have</sup> I have to quote <sup>a thing</sup> that Dan Ellsberg wrote in "Papers on the War" which says this war needs not only to be resisted, it remains to be understood. <sup>I say</sup> <sup>what</sup> <sup>I say</sup> when I give these speeches is that this nuclear arms race <sup>and</sup> our relation to <sup>deindividuated</sup> this <sup>became</sup> piece of history in which we are living remains to be understood as well as to be resisted, because <sup>because</sup> If we don't understand the laws under which we are being

~~perpetually~~  
perpetually into this over-the-cliff-stuff, I don't see how we self-aware, ourselves or, at best, sentient human beings are going to be in a position to resist it, ~~or best to let us say~~

to provide models for other people in the world who are not in this business to ~~mount an~~  
(as Edward Teller reassuringly tells us, it is restricted to the Northern Hemisphere) ~~do any kind of effective resistance to the end of life at least in the northern~~  
understanding of that wedding of the ~~interpsychic~~ and the ~~societal~~, I don't see  
how we are in a position to be effective leaders of the resistance.

I'd like to hear what you would say about all this....?

~~De~~ Well, as I listen to you I think - were you asking for thoughts actually on how to explain yourselves to an administrator <sup>or</sup> what this has to do with your relations with your patients? ~~themselves~~

The legitimacy we have is the legitimacy of working with patients -

~~Daniel~~  
Ellis Berg : Let me speak directly to that -

Your patients share with everyone else, including us, that their lives are threatened. ~~But in a way, if that is realized, you won't have to explain anything and there will not be any accountability after that - so we can put that problem aside - I just made this up - Nuclear War means never having to say your sorry.~~

Quote from late director of Arms Control and Disarmament, Eugene Rostow, former dean of Law School: "We are not living in a postwar society, we are living in a prewar society." It was not for that perception that he was fired from his post but actually it seems, quite recently, for a measure to postpone the war, <sup>that is coming, he was just fired.</sup>

Your patients - all of them - the neurotics, schizophrenics, the personality disorders and the just poor people, innocent people, are living in a society ~~in which~~ which is dominated every where you turn not only by imagery of world annihilation, of a kind that no one has ever lived with unless since <sup>Bosch</sup> Bach was painting - he wasn't hanging his paintings on the walls of the streets, the money they have available is dominated, quite explicitly dominated by the fact that we can't afford money for their mental health because we need it for the machinery of world annihilation. And there is no

secret about that, the threats are not only being made but are being made openly. The imagery of violence on television and movies, which is quite astounding, which they live among, is not, on the whole, that of nuclear war-although thanks to us, it is a bit more this year than it used to be, but quite extraordinary violence is going on in the movies. - Can this all be without its effect on the world - their inner world as you interact with it? *This is their existential situation.* It is all of our situation, but surely it has an effect on them in various ways. Moreover, if they are less than 40 or 50, they have grown up with this in a way that those of us <sup>who</sup> are over 40 (and I am 51) have to make a mental effort to try to adjust <sup>to</sup> and we really can't. I remember a young - when we started the UC conversion project, to try to convey <sup>to</sup> UC that there was something wrong with their being in a university that was simultaneously a bomb factory, that had designed all of our nuclear weapons from the Hiroshima bomb to the Nutron bomb <sup>we wanted to</sup> <sup>develop a critical</sup> make people question that - to ~~make an~~ awareness of that fact - starting with the fact that it was the case, if they didn't know that. The regents were very resistant to see anything critically wrong with this. And I remember a young man (who <sup>later</sup> proceeded to do civil disobedience) getting up in front of the regents to testify on this, and he said, "You know you've been telling us that we are too young, we haven't had the experiences you've had - we didn't experience Munich, the Berlin blockade, Korea, <sup>but I've</sup> <sup>had</sup> an experience that none of you have had - I've had the experience of living all my life on the edge of a nuclear war." That opened my eyes - some of us in this room have had that experience and some have not, and that is a divide just as it is a divide to have grown up from the age when I was 15 and the war had ended, when I was 17, and when I was 18 I was looking at the Berlin blockade, Korea, the Jew doctor trials, and that was my image of Russia and my country, St. George battling this dragon who was the direct heir of Hitler, ~~the~~ imagery and apparently in practice. And <sup>then</sup> there was another generation who came into consciousness in 1965 and has grown up with 10 years of the country bombing a defenseless country and <sup>has seen</sup> ~~seen~~ nothing much else. A period by the way in which Russia wasn't doing much of anything. So, it is a different world - I'm saying that your patients have inhabited a world

that we should try to understand in political terms, in terms of this kind of fear which is a realistic fear.

*John Mack*

"I want to say something - one thought that I want to share with you. I have often met the argument and have <sup>been</sup> given the argument, that the patients are not concerned about nuclear war and about these larger things, they are concerned about everyday things, like their relationship with families, daughters, husbands and wives - <sup>Since</sup> I've become associated with this issue and they know that I work in this area, and I have increasingly been presented with actual cases where the fear of nuclear war is the presenting complaint, <sup>clinically</sup> That's only in the last year, children and adults.

*D.E.*

"I remember at the time that there were <sup>newspaper</sup> stories that psychoanalysts during the Cuban missile crisis were suddenly discovering that their patients were aware <sup>of the threat of nuclear war</sup> as they were after <sup>of</sup> the assassination of Kennedy and various other striking events."

*John*

"The resistance is in the therapist. The American Psychoanalytic for the first time, which is kind of the <sup>Jesuitical</sup> body of <sup>the</sup> mental health movement, is going to have a discussion group, chaired by Dr. Wallerstein, on the psychological aspects of the threat of nuclear war. Wallerstein has canvassed the <sup>2,000</sup> <sup>3,000</sup> psychoanalysts <sup>of analysts</sup> and has come up with only 3 names who have any interest in this subject <sup>whatsoever</sup>. I'm one of them and Martin <sup>Wongh</sup> - I have a letter from him in which he says he can't think of anyone else to invite. <sup>So</sup> This profession is supposed to be about awareness self-awareness - ~~is~~ is the most able to be resistant at this level of any of the professions. [what about the Union of Concerned Psychoanalysts?]

*E. -*

Could there <sup>Intrapyschic</sup> be a certain professional narcissistic disorder here? <sup>a certain unreality</sup>

*Dant*

The intrapsychic emphasis has a defensive aspect when it comes to the world. The answer to your associates question - could be that if we hypothesize that the environment of imagery and actual threat outside the world has some bearing on the dynamics of their relation with you and themselves, that it does well to understand what they are seeing <sup>what they are feeling</sup>. And I'd like to focus on one thing that I didn't

hear in the talks - actually I was tempted to go off on a riff on something

you said there to see where it went, but instead in a very pedestrian way <sup>a sharply as I might have</sup> I'm going to focus instead

on a very immediate aspect of our society, which I don't think I ~~can~~ convey <sup>I shied</sup>

away from it - ~~it is~~ so far in my lectures <sup>her</sup> - and first, the point that I was

interested in not only knowing how to understand Curtis LeMay psychologically

which I am interested <sup>in, but</sup> how do we understand the society that made Curtis LeMay

and his staff and honored him every step of the way for what he was and what he did.

Not because they misunderstood him, but because they understood him perfectly.

What was this society that used him - here was a man that said "use me, and we used him" and not only once, but over a long career, and what was this society? <sup>Re The next point,</sup> I think

I've been inhibited - it's hard for me to come out and say. It is not a random

match between LeMay and this society. ~~It was America~~ that had use for LeMay. And

I don't say that because I believe, because I don't believe that the US is

~~particularly or~~ uniquely murderous or evil or sinful in general <sup>and way,</sup> but I think I do know, I don't

know all the ~~explanations~~ <sup>information</sup>, but I do know something about this society which is not

part of our collective self-image, but is in my mind unquestionably true and can <sup>one other society, our</sup> easily be demonstrated. We are not entirely different from ~~our~~ mother ~~the~~ society,

England it so happens, for reasons that I could ~~not~~ explain, so what I am saying <sup>and have always been.</sup> —

applies to England it so happens, and there are LeMays in England, that these two

societies - England and America - have a quite peculiar and almost unique predilection

for massacre from the air, for high level ~~instrument~~ bombing <sup>indiscriminate</sup> - a way of conducting

war. It is obvious that we are not ~~particularly~~ warlike than other countries, but

our way of conducting war <sup>has</sup> is very definite peculiarities and has been trending <sup>more peculiarly</sup> in that direction since just after WWI. <sup>It was</sup> and fully realized in WW II and now has

an institutional basis which was almost unique in the world until, under the pressure

of humiliations we inflicted on Russia (which did not have an institutional strategic

air command as late as 1961) they acquired one and now they have an institutional basis <sup>for this</sup>

but not the practice, behind. <sup>that we have from</sup> <sup>in the world</sup> Russia, like every other country <sup>except</sup> England,

lacks a history that tells it that it has won a war by bombing people - only two

<sup>in the world</sup> <sup>war of themselves,</sup> and I say "believe it" because countries <sup>believe</sup> especially in the case of England with their bombing of

German ships has a great deal of self-delusion <sup>an</sup> almost cult-like faith. We have

-18- more basis for saying the bombing had an effect

more basis for that in connection with Japan ~~etc.~~ (I'm not talking the atomic but about firebombing).

bomb, ~~but~~ we definitely do believe that <sup>we</sup> won a major war with bombing as the theory told ~~us~~ <sup>them</sup> was possible. So ~~we~~ had the institution that required this faith for its own sense of independence and ~~were~~ <sup>work</sup> fighting under services of the ~~air~~ force.

The institution got its way in WW II, believed that it had been predominantly successful, and on that basis, and with a new weapon, the atom bomb, won a <sup>ever since —</sup> <sup>other</sup> lion's share of the defense budget — a share which no <sup>air</sup> force in any other country got. This country is a bombing country. That has a lot of implications.

In ~~going to mention just one~~

In some ways, it means that we have fears that are somewhat unrealistic, though very natural, because they are projections of our own predilections on other countries that have bombers. Our assumption that Russia would acquire a strategic bombing force after the war was a projection that they were like us. Actually

nobody is like us, and Russia didn't acquire a strategic bombing force and we <sup>up until that period</sup>.

weren't in the danger we assumed we were, <sup>worthy of mention.</sup> They went twenty years without a

strategic bombing force. We thought all that time, as some of you my age will remember, <sup>the bomber gap...</sup>

These turned out to be total illusions, but they had a core of sincerity, based on the assumption that Russia surely would not omit the ability to bomb us, <sup>if they could</sup> <sup>except England</sup> (not realizing to this day there is no other country in ~~the~~ world, that thinks of bombing civilians as the natural way to fight a war.) We're the country that believes that. So, we are peculiarly dangerous to other people when

we defend them <sup>by</sup> ~~with~~ our armed forces, because we defend them with bombers. And

we're peculiarly dangerous to our enemy. Since Brezhnev in '64, we are very dangerous <sup>we are confronting an enemy that now does</sup> to ourselves because ~~they~~ <sup>they</sup> now have the capability to retaliate, which was not 1945?

true after 1942 with Truman. Yet, we go on, although ~~we~~ <sup>we</sup> are perfectly aware that this is now peculiarly dangerous. Let me suggest <sup>of something</sup> a psychology to this —

I said first there is a societal experience which is, in the whole, not in the awareness of most people. How many people could honestly say that they have an image of Americans as warriors, that emphasize bombing?

One way

^ We do have an image in Vietnam is helicopters.

That's new.

^ Now the Russians are doing that in Afghanistan.

I've had that image of England and I assumed that it had something to do with their ~~having their island~~ and perhaps ~~the Americans too of having~~ to do with America's emphasis too. <sup>being an island, and not having the... and that had something</sup>  
<sup>we don't have the experience of people being able to cross our boundaries.</sup>

D.E. — I'm sure there is a psychological aspect of the island <sup>nation</sup> in the distancing of the enemy and there are various aspects. <sup>But there is</sup> One sufficient aspect <sup>right away.</sup> When the <sup>air plane came in to the inventories at the end of World War II, in only two countries, that</sup> ~~was~~ not predominantly armies. Those were the two island powers of America and <sup>ENG</sup> England, where the Navy was <sup>the power.</sup> In all the Continental countries, the liberal and the ~~non~~ liberal ones, France, Germany, Russia, the armies managed to keep the air plane to its purposes: reconnaissance, artillery spotting, and close air support of army, and that was true of Hitler's Germany. <sup>strategic bombing,</sup>  
Despite Gehring's admiration for the English, <sup>in</sup> he wasn't allowed to build long-range bombers. The two countries where the air force - where the army was rudimentary <sup>in</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>peace time, because of being island powers,</sup> <sup>had</sup> <sup>in</sup> <sup>persists</sup> <sup>exist</sup> <sup>air power & most</sup> <sup>persistent</sup> <sup>an</sup> <sup>power.</sup> <sup>was</sup> <sup>LeMay faced up, (This is realism now, combined with a motivational aspect.)</sup> LeMay faced up to the genuine limitations of the bomber and realized that it was good for only one thing; destroying cities, <sup>It was</sup> not good for destroying factories because it couldn't hit factories. There was an <sup>in</sup> <sup>intentionally</sup> <sup>intense</sup> resistance to perceiving that <sup>year after year</sup> they kept trying to hit factories and having not much effect.

LeMay finally realized that what they were really good at was killing people,  
then he had this motivational aspect that  
and he was willing to do that. Allowed him to use it that way. We can do that,  
if you optimize for it,  
if you do it right, The bomber can do that. So he turned the bomber - it meant  
using the bomber in a new way. It was a way the bomber could be used. The bomber  
was an instrument of destroying cities.